



CLARK COUNTY

RFP #824

AGING READINESS PLAN (ARP) UPDATE

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

UPDATED: APRIL 19, 2022

QUESTION	ANSWER
<p>1. Can you provide clarification between respondent's capabilities and project approach and understanding since in project approach and understanding, you reference number four (Section IIC.4)? For project approach were you looking for the traditional scope and work experience or something different?</p>	<p>Submitted proposals must stay within the requested page count.</p> <p>We are looking for a traditional scope, but we are interested in creative ideas to the approach and scope. You may include scope modifications as they make sense to do so.</p> <p>If there are aspects to suggest outside the scope, you may do so. But the content will not be a part of the evaluation/scoring.</p> <p>Submitted proposals must stay within the requested page count.</p>
<p>2. For work experience, do you want references or any particular format for explaining our work experience?</p>	<p>For work experience, we were looking for similar types of projects and examples of work that you have done. For references, we are looking for specific names and contact information as opposed to anything more than that. We are asking for at least two and no more than three references. The references will be contacted by county staff.</p> <p>In your project descriptions, if you wish for us to contact other project owners, you can put that in your project information. Staff may or may not contact the people listed in project descriptions.</p> <p>We would prefer you to have references listed in a separate area of your proposal so we can easily find the people you intend for us to contact.</p> <p>We did not specify a particular format so it is up to you how you would like to present that information. We are interested in getting enough information for us to get a flavor of what the project was and why it might be relevant to this proposal.</p>
<p>3. Can you talk a little more about your vision for communications and outreach? Due to the pandemic, we don't know if we will be meeting in person. It looks like there are some public workshops and meetings with the commission listed. Can you describe what you envision for</p>	<p>We are very open to creative ideas. We are interested in what you would like to propose on a suggested approach. We are not envisioning a complete overhaul of this plan or extensive community outreach. We want to refresh the existing plan. The community workshops/meeting with Commission on Aging (COA) are the main outreach. We are open to suggestions on what the meetings look like, and how they are used. Once a selection is made, we are open to negotiating with the firm on what makes sense given the proposed approach.</p>

	<p>working with the broader community to help influence this plan and if you are set on this approach or open to new suggestions? Can you outline a sense of your vision for the community engagement piece?</p> <p>We are an outward focused and engaging commission. We encourage responders to look at the expectations in the RFP for outreach, and meetings, and tell us how you plan to use county staff and COA members in these efforts. COA members are very interested in supporting the project outreach.</p> <p>Clark County contains a heavy mixture of urban and rural areas. The proposed outreach will look different based on the focused area.</p> <p>We are looking at adding a new chapter to the Aging Readiness Plan (ARP) that deals with emergency preparedness. That decision was driven by many of the issues brought on by COVID-19. We are interested in learning about direct experience in this area.</p> <p>We presume the workshops and meetings will be in-person or a hybrid of both options, but that could change. We are looking to the County Council for future guidance on meeting formats. For budgeting purposes, please use the assumption that workshops and commission meetings will be in-person or hybrid.</p>
<p>4. The task force that was involved in the original plan included some collaborators from PSU (Portland State University). I was wondering if some of those people have been involved since the original plan was finalized. Just curious if those collaborators have been involved since the Aging Readiness Task Force?</p>	<p>Alan (DeLaTorre) from PSU (Institute on Aging) frequently assisted with some of COA's focus areas and was a speaker for the commission many times while he was still at PSU. He was also a participant in several forums and similar events.</p> <p>The COA has maintained a strong relationship with many of the original 25 Aging Readiness Task Force members, which included a wide range of representation from various organizations and individuals. The Area Agency on Aging and Disabilities of Southwest Washington was a co-partner in the development of the Aging Readiness Plan. The COA has maintained a strong relationship with their staff and advisory board. Community in Motion (previously the Human Services Council), C-Tran and other agencies also had representatives on the original task force and are groups that COA has worked closely with since that time.</p> <p>The main topics in the ARP, include housing, supportive services, community engagement, healthy communities, transportation and education awareness and advocacy. There was someone on the task force that was affiliated with each topic, and we have maintained contact with those individuals and agencies and supported partnerships with all of them.</p> <p>In relation to the communications approach, we are not trying to re-create the effort that led to the Aging Readiness Task Force. But we are interested in how you would propose engaging many of those entities in this update.</p>

5.	There was a link in the email that was forwarded, and the link did not work. It was from internal services.	<p>The link that goes to the main RFP page is https://clark.wa.gov/internal-services/request-proposal-1 and is correctly listed within the RFP.</p> <p>It is the proposer's responsibility to ensure they are reviewing page for the Q&A updates.</p>
6.	Disclaimer	<p>The chair of the commission, Chuck Green, is employed by OTAK. Because of his work in developing the RFP, and because he is an evaluator, OTAK is precluded from responding to the RFP.</p>